2001 base fee of $2.22 per bale. The formula in the Act provides for the use of the percentage change in the implicit price deflator of the gross national product (as indexed for the most recent 12-month period for which statistics are available). However, gross national product has been replaced by the gross domestic product by the Department of Commerce as a more appropriate measure for the short-term monitoring and analysis of the U.S. economy.

The number of bales to be classed by the United States Department of Agriculture from the 2001 crop is estimated at 18,337,850 bales. The 2001 base fee was decreased 15 percent based on the estimated number of bales to be classed (1 percent for every 100,000 bales or portion thereof above the base of 12,500,000, limited to a maximum adjustment of 15 percent). This percentage factor amounts to a 33 cents per bale reduction and was subtracted from the 2001 base fee of $2.22 per bale, resulting in a fee of $1.89 per bale.

With a fee of $1.89 per bale, the projected operating reserve would be 51.56 percent. The Act specifies that the Secretary shall not establish a fee which, when combined with other sources of revenue, will result in a projected operating reserve of more than 25 percent. Accordingly, the fee of $1.89 must be reduced by 54 cents per bale, to $1.35 per bale, to provide an ending accumulated operating reserve for the fiscal year of 25 percent of the projected cost of operating the program. This would establish the 2001 season fee at $1.35 per bale.

Accordingly, § 28.909, paragraph (b) would reflect the continuation of the HVI classification fee at $1.35 per bale.

As provided for in the Uniform Cotton Classing Fees Act of 1987, as amended, a 5 cent per bale discount would continue to be applied to voluntary centralized billing and collecting agents as specified in § 28.909(c).

Growers or their designated agents requesting classification data provided on computer punched cards will continue to be charged the fee of 10 cents per card in § 28.910(a) to reflect the costs of providing this service. Requests for punch card classification data represented less than 1.0 percent of the total bales classed from the 2000 crop, down from 2.6 percent in 1997. Growers or their designated agents receiving classification data by methods other than computer-punched cards would continue to incur no additional fees if only one method of receiving classification data was requested. The fee for each additional method of receiving classification data in § 28.910 would remain at 5 cents per bale, and it would be applicable even if the same method was requested. However, if computer punched cards were requested, a fee of 10 cents per card would be charged. The fee in § 28.910(b) for an owner receiving classification data from the central database would remain at 5 cents per bale, and the minimum charge of $5.00 for services provided per monthly billing period would remain the same. The provisions of § 28.910(c) concerning the fee for new classification memoranda issued from the central database for the business convenience of an owner without reclassification of the cotton will remain the same.

The fee for review classification in § 28.911 would be maintained at $1.35 per bale.

The fee for returning samples after classification in § 28.911 would remain at 40 cents per sample.

A fifteen-day comment period is provided for public comments. This period is deemed appropriate because it is anticipated that the proposed changes, if adopted, would be made effective July 1, 2001, as provided by the Cotton Statistics and Estimates Act.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 28

Administrative practice and procedure, Cotton, Cotton samples, Grades, Market news, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Standards, Staples, Testing, Warehouses.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR Part 28 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 28—COTTON CLASSING, TESTING, AND STANDARDS

Subpart D—Cotton Classification and Market News Service for Producers

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR Part 28, Subpart D, continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 471–476.

2. In § 28.909, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 28.909 Costs.

* * * * *

(b) The cost of High Volume Instrument (HVI) cotton classification service to producers is $1.35 per bale.

* * * * *

3. In § 28.911, the last sentence of paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

§ 28.911 Review classification.

(a) * * * The fee for review classification is $1.35 per bale.

* * * * *

Dated: April 18, 2001.

Kenneth C. Clayton,

Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 01–10065 Filed 4–19–01; 2:06 pm]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 2000–NM–201–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd., Model Galaxy Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: This action withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that proposed a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd., Model Galaxy airplanes. That action would have required replacement of certain existing fasteners in the aft pickup fittings of the horizontal stabilizer. Since the issuance of the NPRM, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has received information from Galaxy Aerospace Company indicating that the replacement has already been carried out on all the affected airplanes and that the replacement is now standard on all airplanes off the production line. Accordingly, the proposed rule is withdrawn.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dan Rodina, Aerospace Engineer, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2125; fax (206) 227–1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations to add a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd., Model Galaxy airplanes, was published in the **Federal Register** on October 30, 2000 (65 FR 64631). The proposed rule would have required replacement of certain existing fasteners in the aft pickup fittings of the horizontal stabilizer. That action was prompted by information from the Civil Aviation Administration of Israel (CAAI), which is the airworthiness authority for Israel, indicating that early fatigue failure of the fasteners that support the aft pickup fittings of the horizontal stabilizer can occur. The proposed actions were intended to prevent such fatigue failure,

which could result in reduced structural integrity of the empennage.

Actions That Occurred Since the NPRM Was Issued

Since the issuance of that NPRM, the FAA has received a comment from Galaxy Aerospace Company indicating that the replacement of the fasteners in the aft pickup fittings of the horizontal stabilizers has been accomplished on all the affected airplanes. Therefore, Galaxy requested the FAA to withdraw the proposed rule.

FAA's Conclusions

The FAA agrees that there is no need to issue the proposed AD, if all of its requirements have already been accomplished. The FAA, therefore, withdraws the proposed AD.

Withdrawal of this NPRM constitutes only such action, and does not preclude the agency from issuing another notice in the future, nor does it commit the agency to any course of action in the future.

Regulatory Impact

Since this action only withdraws a NPRM, it is neither a proposed nor a final rule and therefore, is not covered under Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979).

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Withdrawal

Accordingly, the notice of proposed rulemaking, Docket 2000–NM–201–AD, published in the **Federal Register** October 30, 2000 (65 FR 64631), is withdrawn.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 16, 2001.

Donald L. Riggin,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 01–9880 Filed 4–20–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

28 CFR Part 16

[AAG/A Order No. 228–2001]

Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation

AGENCY: Department of Justice.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), Joint Automated Booking System (JABS) Program Office proposes to establish its new Privacy Act regulations. The DOJ proposes to exempt a new Privacy Act system of records entitled, ''Nationwide Joint Automated Booking System (JABS), DOJ–005'' from subsections (c)(3) and (4), (d), (e)(1), (2) and (3), (4)(G) and (H), (e)(5) and (8), (f) and (g) of the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a), pursuant to 552a(j)(2) and (k)(2). Information in this system of records relates to matters of law enforcement, and the exemptions are necessary to avoid interference with law enforcement responsibilities and to protect the privacy of third parties. The reasons for the exemptions are set forth in the text below.

DATES: Submit any comments by May 23, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Address all comments to Mary Cahill, Management Analyst, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530 (Room 1400, National Place Building).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Cahill, (202) 307–1823.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the notice section of today's **Federal Register**, the Department of Justice provides a description of this system of records.

This order relates to individuals rather than small business entities. Nevertheless, pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, it is hereby stated that the order will not have ''a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.''

List of Subjects in Part 16

Administrative Practices and Procedure, Courts, Freedom of Information Act, Government in the Sunshine Act, and the Privacy Act.

Dated: April 9, 2001.

Janis A. Sposato,

Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Attorney General by 5 U.S.C. 552a and delegated to me by Attorney General Order No. 793–78, it is proposed to amend 28 CFR part 16, as follows.

PART 16—[AMENDED]

1. The authority for part 16 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301, 552, 552a, 552b(g), 553; 18 U.S.C. 4203(a)(1); 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 534; 31 U.S.C. 3717, 901.

2. It is proposed to add § 16.131 to read as follows:

§ 16.131 Exemption of Department of Justice (DOJ)/Nationwide Joint Automated Booking System (JABS), DOJ–005.

(a) The following system of records is exempt from 5 U.S.C. 552a(c) (3) and (4), (d), (e)(1), (2), (3), (4) (G) and (H), (e)(5) and (8), (f) and (g): Nationwide Joint Automated Booking System, Justice/DOJ–005. These exemptions apply only to the extent that information in the system is subject to exemption pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2) and (k)(2). Where compliance would not interfere with or adversely affect the law enforcement process, the DOJ may waive the exemptions, either partially or totally.

(b) Exemption from the particular subsections are justified for the following reasons:

(1) From subsections (c)(3), (c)(4), and (d) to the extent that access to records in this system of records may impede or interfere with law enforcement efforts, result in the disclosure of information that would constitute an unwarranted invasion of the personal privacy of collateral record subjects or other third parties, and/or jeopardize the health and/or safety of third parties.

(2) From subsection (e)(1) to the extent that it is necessary to retain all information in order not to impede, compromise, or interfere with law enforcement efforts, e.g., where the significance of the information may not be readily determined and/or where such information may provide leads or assistance to federal and other law enforcement agencies in discharging their law enforcement responsibilities.

(3) From subsection (e)(2) because, in some instances, the application of this provision would present a serious impediment to law enforcement since it may be necessary to obtain and verify information from a variety of sources other than the record subject to ensure safekeeping, security, and effective law enforcement. For example, it may be necessary that medical and psychiatric personnel provide information regarding the subject's behavior, physical health, or mental stability, etc. to ensure proper care while in custody, or it may be necessary to obtain information from a case agent or the court to ensure proper disposition of the subject individual.

(4) From subsection (e)(3) because the requirement that agencies inform each individual whom it asks to supply information of such information as is required by subsection (e)(3) may, in some cases, impede the information gathering process or otherwise interfere with or compromise law enforcement efforts, e.g., the subject may deliberately